



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

H.A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,679	01/14/2004	Zhaohui Gao	IBMS.073PA(0514)	4112
62627	7590	02/16/2007		
DAVID W. LYNCH CHAMBLISS, BAHNER & STOPHEL 1000 TALLAN SQUARE-S TWO UNION SQUARE CHATTANOOGA, TN 37402			EXAMINER KEATON, SHERROD L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2109	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/757,679

Applicant(s)

GAO ET AL.

Examiner

sherrod keaton

Art Unit

2109

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the original filing of January 14, 2004. Claims 1-29 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling on how to control data that is presented in a tabular display, does not reasonably provide enablement for controlling the widget. The product in this claim consists of a single step: "controlling how data is presented in a tabular display comprising a widget", and thus is interpreted as a single means/single step claim under MPEP 2164.08(a).

"A single means claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In re Hyatt, 708 F.2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (A single means claim which covered every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor.). When claims depend on a recited property, a fact situation comparable

Art Unit: 2109

to Hyatt is possible, where the claim covers every conceivable structure (means) for achieving the stated property (result) while the specification discloses at most only those known to the inventor."

2. Examiner's Note. The Applicant appears to be attempting to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph in Claim 23 by using "means-plus-function" language. However, the Examiner notes that the only "means" for performing these cited functions in the specification appears to be a computer with a display, memory and a processor. While the claims pass the first test of the three-prong test used to determine invocation of paragraph 6, since no other specific structural limitations are disclosed in the specification, the claim does not meet the other tests of the three-prong test. Therefore, 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph has not been invoked when considering these claims below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

4. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shostak (5893125).

Claims 1, 12, 23 and 24: Shostak discloses a program, device, means and method readable by a computer, the program storage device tangibly embodying one or more programs of instructions executable by the computer to perform operations for controlling how data is presented in tabular display comprising:

- a.) presenting a display to a user (Column 10, Lines 25-38);
- b.) providing a view configuration widget on the display (Column 8, Lines 11-34),
(Fig. 3b);
- c.) view configured according to a setting of the view configuration widget (Column 8, Lines 11-34);
- d.) memory for storing data for display (Column 6, Lines 53-67); and
- e.) processor, coupled to memory, the processor being configured for presenting a view configuration widget for display and presenting a view configuration according to a setting of the view configuration widget (Column 6, Lines 53-67).

Claims 2, 13 and 26: Shostak discloses a program and method readable by a computer, the program storage device tangibly embodying one or more programs of instructions executable by the computer to perform operations for controlling how data is presented in a tabular display as in Claims 1, 12, and 24 above and further discloses a view configuration widget comprising presenting a graphic user interface having a selector (Column 7, Lines 13-26).

Claims 25: Shostak discloses a graphical user interface for controlling how data is presented in a tabular display, comprising a view configuration widget presented on a display device, the view configuration widget setting a configuration for viewing information on the display (Column 10, Lines 25-38), (Column 8, Lines 11-34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 27, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under Shostak (5893125).

Claims 3, 14 and 27: Shostak discloses a program and method presenting a graphic user interface having a selector as in Claims 2, 13, and 26 above but does not explicitly disclose a view configuration widget comprising presenting a graphic user interface having a selector disclosing presenting a graphic user interface having a selector providing 2 by 2 matrix of buttons, wherein selection of a first of the buttons causing a subset of columns and a subset of rows of a table to be displayed, selection of a second

Art Unit: 2109

of the buttons causing all columns and a subset of rows of the table to be displayed, selection of a third of the buttons causing a subset of columns and all rows of the to be displayed and selection of a fourth of the buttons causing all columns and all rows of the table to be displayed, however Shostak does disclose allowing the user to select different views with a button which can display a plurality of select rows and columns(Fig 7-12). This button allows user to display the four apparent options of a table. The only four possible choices in which to view information on a table include some of the rows and some of the columns, all the rows and some of the columns, all the columns and some of the rows, or all and all, Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display the matrix of buttons in a 2 by 2 matrix or a 1 by 4 matrix. One would have been motivated to have this display in order to allow a readily selection to the user which improves the user friendliness.

Claims 4, 15 and 28: Shostak discloses a program and method readable by a computer, the program storage device tangibly embodying one or more programs of instructions executable by the computer to perform operations for controlling how data is presented in a tabular display as in Claims 1, 12 and 24 above but does not explicitly disclose providing a drop-down menu for selecting the items but does allow the user to select the settings for the view in which they would like to select(Fig 3C), (Column 8, Lines 4-58). Drop down, pull down, and pop up menus are all common methods for displaying and selecting information and would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 2109

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. One would have been motivated to add a drop down menu to show the user a flowing display of the options available.

6. Claims 5-11, 16-22, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under Shostak (5893125) in further view of Rao et al(6085202).

Claims 5, 16 and 29: Shostak discloses providing a drop down menu and having items selectable by a user for setting a view configuration as in Claims 4, 15 and 28 above but does not explicitly disclose providing a menu of row selections and a menu for column selections, but does Rao et al does disclose allowing row and column selection therefore it is inherent that there is some type of menu allowed for this selection.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention have to have a menu in Shostak for row and column selection. One would have been motivated to have a menu this allows the user to set display combinations and in a quick process which improves efficiency.

Claims 6 and 17: Shostak discloses a drop down menu providing a menu of row and column selection as in Claim 5 and 16 above but does not explicitly disclose providing a selection for displaying all of the rows. However, Rao et al does discloses a user interface for row and column sorting, reordering, and addition (Column 6, Lines 15-20).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Shostak to allow displaying all rows. One would have been

Art Unit: 2109

motivated to allow displaying all rows to allow thorough examination of information in the rows, which can improve quality.

Claims 7 and 18: Shostak discloses a drop down menu providing a menu of row and column selection as in Claim 5 and 16 above but does not explicitly disclose providing a predetermined configuration of the rows. However, Rao et al does disclose a user interface for row and column sorting, reordering, and addition (Column 6, Lines 15-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Shostak to allow predetermined configuration of rows. One would have been motivated to allow predetermined configuration of rows to allow thorough examination of information in select rows, which can quicken searches and improve quality.

Claims 8 and 19: Shostak discloses a drop down menu providing a menu of row and column selection as in Claim 5 and 16 above but does not explicitly disclose displaying data relative to a predetermined time. However, Rao et al does disclose a user interface for row and column sorting, reordering, and addition (Column 6, Lines 15-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Shostak to allow displaying data of a predetermined time. One would have been motivated to allow displaying data of a predetermined time to allow thorough examination of information in select rows, which can quicken searches and improve quality.

Claims 9 and 20: Shostak discloses a drop down menu providing a menu of row and column selection as in Claim 5 and 16 above but does not explicitly disclose providing a selection for displaying all of the columns. However, Rao et al does disclose a user interface for row and column sorting, reordering, and addition (Column 6, Lines 15-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Shostak to allow displaying all columns. One would have been motivated to allow displaying all columns to allow thorough examination of information in the columns, which can improve quality.

Claims 10 and 21: Shostak discloses a drop down menu providing a menu of row and column selection as in Claim 5 and 16 above but does not explicitly disclose displaying only predetermined primary columns. However, Rao et al does disclose a user interface for row and column sorting, reordering, and addition (Column 6, Lines 15-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Shostak to display only predetermined primary columns. One would have been motivated to allow display of predetermined primary columns to allow thorough examination of information in select columns, which can quicken searches and improve quality.

Claims 11 and 22: Shostak discloses a drop down menu providing a menu of row and column selection as in Claim 5 and 16 above but does not explicitly disclose a custom selection for presenting predetermined columns. However, Rao et al does disclose a user interface for row and column sorting, reordering, and addition (Column 6, Lines 15-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Shostak to display a custom selection for presenting predetermined columns. One would have been motivated to display a custom selection for presenting predetermined columns to allow thorough examination of information in select columns, which can quicken searches and improve quality.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a.) MacGregor et al. (5396621) Sorting a Table by Rows or Columns in response to interactive prompting with a dialog box graphical icon

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

Art Unit: 2109

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAMES MYHRE can be reached on 571) 270-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK
2-7-07


James Myhre
Supervisory Patent Examiner